Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending and rejected. Claims 1-2 are amended by this amendment. Applicant notes that the amendments to claims 1-2 are made to clarify claims 1-2 by correcting clerical errors, and that these amendments have not been made in response to a rejection. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-20.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-14, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,324,179 (Doshi) in view of U.S. Patent 5,084,816 (Boese). Claims 1 and 11 recite a telecommunication processing system and its method of operation. The processing system receives "a first signaling message from a narrowband network element." The processing system transfers "a second signaling message indicating the route instruction to a packet network element." The packet network element "receives user communications transferred from the narrowband network element, and transfers the user communications over a packet network responsive to the second signaling message."

The Office Action asserts that Doshi teaches the transfer of the second signaling message as claimed. (See Office Action dated 6/22/07, pages 2-3; and see Doshi, figure 1 and column 4, lines 15-25, 40-50). The section of Doshi cited in the Office Action teaches that signal processor 215-1 in ATM switch 215 receives a Signaling System Seven (SS7) Initial Address Message (IAM) from Local Exchange Carrier (LEC) 100. Thus, the cited section of Doshi only teaches the receipt of the ***first*** signaling message from the narrowband network element. The cited section of Doshi does not teach the transfer of the ***second*** signaling message to the packet network element as claimed.

In Doshi, Terminal Adaptor (TA) 210 comprises the packet network element that receives user communications from the narrowband network element. (See Doshi, column 7, lines 17-36). TA 210 uses a pre-determined table to select the packet address for routing the user communication. (See Doshi, column 7, line 20). TA 210 does not receive a signaling message including a routing instruction as claimed. TA 210 may receive a control instruction indicating ***when*** to accumulate data for packets, but this control instruction is not a route instruction. (See Doshi, column 10, lines 1-15). Doshi does not teach the transfer of the second signaling message as claimed.

The recent Office Action does not assert that Boese teaches the transfer of the second signaling message as claimed. Applicant could not find any sections of Boese

that teach the transfer of the second signaling message as claimed. Thus, neither Doshi not Boese teach the transfer of the second signaling message as claimed.

Claim 11 also requires that the telecommunication processing system "is external to the narrowband network element, the packet network element, and other network elements that transfer the user communications." In Doshi, signal processor 215-1 and call processor 215-2 represent at least portions of the telecommunication processing system. (See Doshi, column 4, line 45 to column 5, line 16). Both signal processor 215-1 and call processor 215-2 are included in ATM switch 215. (See Doshi, Figure 1). Since ATM switch 215 also transfers user communications, Doshi does not teach a telecommunication processing system that is external to the network elements that transfer the user communications.

Boese teaches a fault-tolerant design for a Service Control Point (SCP). (See Boese, Abstract). SCPs respond to queries from processing systems in switches. (See Boese, column 1, lines 29-47). Boese does not suggest removing these processing systems from the switches. Even when Doshi and Boese are combined, signal processor 215-1 and call processor 215-2 would remain within ATM switch 215. Thus, neither Doshi not Boese teach the claimed telecommunication processing system that is external to the network elements that transfer the user communications.

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 12-14, and 16-17 are patentable for at least the reasons given above.

Claims 5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,324,179 (Doshi) in view of U.S. Patent 5,084,816 (Boese) further in view of U.S. Patent 5,533,115 (Hollenbach). Claims 5 and 15 are patentable for at least the reasons given above.

Claims 8-10 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,324,179 (Doshi) in view of U.S. Patent 5,084,816 (Boese) further in view of U.S. Patent 5,394,463 (Fischell). Claims 8-10 and 18-20 are patentable for at least the reasons given above.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that there are numerous additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interests of brevity. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-20.

Included herewith is payment for the appropriate fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(1) for a one-month extension of time (37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)). Applicant believes that there are no additional fees due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine additional fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 210765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Setter/
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER
Michael J. Setter, Reg. No. 37,936
Setter Roche LLP
Telephone: (720) 562-2280

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004
Attn: Melissa A. Jobe
Sprint Law Department
6450 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHN0312-3A461
Overland Park, KS 66251